

from facing another cliff and the two Chambers have not yet been able to conference a long-term transportation solution. I just talked to Chairman SHUSTER of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. They marked up a 6-year reauthorization bill just this last Thursday. I am proud to see that both Chambers are on similar pages.

Both bills recognize the need for a national freight program. We approach it just a little differently, but there is nothing that can't be reconciled in a matter of minutes. Further, environmental streamlining is absolutely necessary. Both bills are doing that. We place a new focus on innovation which provides States with flexibility, as in my State of Oklahoma. When we give flexibility to the States, we get a lot more done. This idea that no good ideas are put to work unless they originate in Washington is just not true. Also, long-term certainty, which we are very much concerned with, is there, and it is now a reality. We are now one step closer to putting America back on the map as a place to do business.

It is my understanding that the House intends to move Chairman SHUSTER's 6-year reauthorization bill through the full House over the next 2 weeks. I just spoke with him a few minutes ago. Unlike in years past, I expect a very short conference period. Because we still face this important process, Congress will need one more extension to get us to the finish line. The finish line should be the 20th of November, and it can be done. When I say a very short conference period, it is because there is very little difference between the House bill and the Senate bill. I have talked to the likely conferees, and they are in accord with the idea that we can do this in a matter of hours, not days. I realize there are a lot of moving discussions on larger deals on the debt limit and budget caps; however, there is agreement that the surface transportation bill can and will move on its own timeline.

The House will move a short-term extension to November 20 this week. The ones I have talked to assure me that is going to happen. I hope the Senate passes it quickly so the House can move the T&I-reported bill on the floor and we can move to a quickly resolved conference. Due to the similarity in both bills, I am confident we can and should have this on the President's desk by Thanksgiving.

If we fail to get this done by November 20, we are going to be faced with two significant hurdles: First, Congress has other pressing deadlines to address in December—to include December 11, when funding of the Federal Government expires, and December 31, when a host of important tax provisions will expire. Another December 31 deadline would be the provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act.

I can remember in years past when we got dangerously close to December 31. One time the Big Four had to take

it, and it was not even a product of the committees. I was one of the Big Four. We were able to pass it, but we came so close to December 31, it was scary. Here we are, in the middle of a bunch of wars, and all of a sudden we would have provisions out there—reenlistment bonuses, hazard pay, and things that would expire. Nothing would be worse than to have our kids in combat facing that.

We are addressing these deadlines that will require Congress's undivided attention. Some of the solutions for these bills could result, I fear, in Members attempting to siphon off the payoffs of the DRIVE Act. That is why this is important.

The second significant hurdle we face is that later this year the highway trust fund will drop to a dangerously low level, as DOT Secretary Foxx has warned. At that point, agencies at the Federal and State level will begin to implement cash management procedures that significantly affect the States' construction seasons. In the majority of the United States, we would lose a construction season in States such as Iowa and in Northern States. Mark my words: A failure by Congress to enact a long-term bill by Thanksgiving will result in a loss of the 2016 construction season. Congress is going to return to its current pattern of short-term extensions. Again, short-term extensions syphon about 30 percent off the top. It is a terrible outcome that should be avoided at all costs. We have the opportunity to do it now. By making industry and States continue to hold their breath and budgets, we rob taxpayers of cost-efficient project planning and continue to stall on launching major economy-boosting projects.

Look at my State of Oklahoma, which lost \$63 million in construction dollars over the last few years as a direct result of inefficiency and contracting uncertainty that comes from short-term extensions. I have used that figure of 30 percent off the top with some of my conservative friends. I said: If you oppose a long-term extension, a long-term reauthorization bill, then you are saying that you want to have the liberal alternative, which is to lose 30 percent off the top.

With a fully funded long-term reauthorization, Oklahoma would actually see a savings of \$122 million and millions more in efficiency savings from long-term commitments and early completion savings from contracts. This is something a lot of people don't realize. The streamline you get—many of the NEPA requirements and the environmental requirements can be offset if you are able to get to a long-term bill. But you can't do it, you can't start any large projects—not any of these big projects—the bridge projects and others you can't do on short-term extensions. We haven't had an authorization bill since 2005, and I believe it is time for Congress to fulfill its constitutional duty to fund our roads and our bridges.

As I said earlier, I am confident that the Senate and House will work together to get this bill to the President's desk within the next few weeks. That is my wish for my counterpart on the House side, Chairman SHUSTER—the best of luck in moving forward. He is now committed to doing that. He is going to get this done. He kept his word in getting the job done last Thursday, and now he is going to be able to get this bill up so that we can conference it together. I anticipate we can do a conference in a matter of a few hours. It wouldn't take the normal time.

That is good news. It is good news to come back on a Monday and find that we are going to be doing what the Constitution says we ought to be doing, and that is roads and bridges.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF LAWRENCE VILARDO

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise to take a moment to congratulate the soon-to-be confirmed district judge for the Western District of New York, Larry Vilardo. He is from the Western District. It could not come too soon, because the Western District has been working without a single sitting Federal judge. That will finally change once Mr. Vilardo has been confirmed. He will now begin to hear cases and tackle the backlog that has been steadily building in the Western District. There are few more qualified to help take on this task than Larry Vilardo. That is because Mr. Vilardo is a classic Buffalonian—hard working, salt of the earth, honest, and grounded. He went to Canisius College and then took a brief detour out of Western New York to attend Harvard Law School and clerk on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Texas before returning home and becoming one of Buffalo's leading legal lights, practicing at a firm he co-founded.

Buffalo is where he was born, raised, and educated, and where he chose to raise his family. Buffalo is in his bones. They love him in Buffalo. When this vacancy occurred, I heard the voices in Buffalo chanting: Vilardo, Vilardo, Vilardo—not just the legal community but just about the whole community. Like so many other people from the region, the city has made him tough, level-headed, fair, and decent.

As the first in his family to graduate from college, he adds an important element to the socioeconomic diversity of the court. The people of the Western District are incredibly lucky to have

Larry Vilardo on the bench. I congratulate Larry Vilardo on this milestone of his career.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lawrence Joseph Vilardo, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be up to 30 minutes of debate.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING BILL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, tomorrow we will be turning to the cyber security bill, which the Presiding Officer is familiar with as a member of the committee, and I wish to speak about my amendment No. 2621 to that legislation. I also intend to address the amendments of our colleagues Senator FRANKEN, Senator HELLER, and Senator COONS because I believe all four of these amendments seek to achieve the same goal, and that goal—the goal of all four of these amendments—is to reduce the unnecessary sharing of Americans' private and personal information.

The Senate has had a robust debate on the cyber security bill over the past week, and I think it is fair to say that Senators agree on a fair number of points. For example, the sponsors of the legislation have now acknowledged that the cyber security bill we will shortly vote on would not have prevented sophisticated cyber attacks, such as the Target and Home Depot hacks, and it would not have prevented the theft of millions of personnel records at the Office of Personnel Management.

As for my part, I agree that sharing information about cyber security threats is generally a constructive idea. If private companies identify samples of malicious code or information that identifies foreign hackers, I would absolutely encourage them to share that information. However, I think companies should also take reasonable steps—and I underline “reasonable steps”—to remove unrelated personal information about their customers before sharing that data with the government. It is important to understand that this legislation simply does not require companies to do that, and Senators can see that for themselves. As Senators can see for themselves, on page 17 of the bill, companies are allowed to conduct only a cursory review of the information they provide and would only be required to remove data that they know is personal information unrelated to cyber security.

When it comes to customers' personal information, the message behind this bill is, when in doubt, hand it over. Once that data is shared—and this is not widely known—the Department of Homeland Security would be required to send it on to a broad range of government agencies, from the NSA to the FBI.

The amendment I have offered to the legislation we will vote on tomorrow would give companies a real responsibility for safeguarding their customers' information. It would say that in order for a company to receive liability protection before a company shares data with the government, it has to make efforts to the extent feasible to remove any personal information that is not necessary to identify or describe a cyber security threat. In my view, that would give this legislation a straightforward standard that could give consumers real confidence that their privacy is actually being protected.

Let me give an example of how this might work in practice. Imagine that a health insurance company finds out that millions of its customers' records have been stolen. If that company has any evidence about who the hackers were or how they stole this information, of course it makes sense to share that information with the government. But the company shouldn't simply say “Well, here you go” and hand millions of its customers' financial and medical records over for distribution to a broad array of government agencies, such as the FBI and the NSA.

The records of the victims of a hack should not be treated the same way information about the hacker is treated. Companies should be required to make reasonable efforts to remove personal information that is not needed for cyber security before they hand that information over to the government. That, in short, is what my amendment seeks to achieve.

The sponsors of the legislation have argued that my amendment would somehow hold companies to an almost impossible standard. I say respectfully

that the language of this amendment is quite measured. Companies are required to remove unrelated personal information and the legislation specifically states “to the extent feasible.” The language certainly doesn't require perfection; it creates a reasonable and flexible approach for companies to make a real effort to remove unrelated personal information about their customers instead of simply performing the sort of cursory review that would be permitted under the current language of the bill.

A quick reading through the list of the pending amendments to the bill will make it clear that I am not the only Member of this body who is concerned about the unnecessary sharing of personal information.

Our colleague from Nevada, Senator HELLER, has a similar amendment that would seek to create a stronger requirement for companies to remove personal information.

Our colleague from Delaware, Senator COONS, has crafted a very constructive amendment that would strengthen the requirement for review by the Department of Homeland Security. His amendment would create a stronger obligation for the Homeland Security Department to filter out unnecessary personal information before passing cyber security data on to other parts of our government.

Senator FRANKEN has drafted a strong amendment that would clarify the bill's definition of “cyber security threat information” to ensure that it focuses on information about real threats.

It is important to remember that reducing unnecessary sharing of personal information will make any information sharing program more effective and easier to focus on the genuine threats involved.

Finally, our colleague from Arizona, Senator FLAKE, has drafted an amendment that would require the Congress to come back and review this information sharing approach after 6 years to evaluate how it has worked in practice and whether privacy protections ought to be strengthened.

I have cited amendments by Democrats and Republicans. The Presiding Officer knows that I feel strongly about working in a bipartisan way whenever I possibly can, and that is why I thought it was important to mention, as we go through these amendments, that all of these amendments I have described have sought to ensure this body would make it clear that cyber security is a very real problem. Cyber security, in terms of tackling it, which involves information sharing, can be very constructive, and we ought to try to find ways to do it. Each of these amendments is designed to make sure that when Americans hear about cyber security legislation—my colleague and I have discussed it—we don't have millions of Americans walking away and saying: They are sharing all of this unnecessary personal and unrelated information; I